



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22 www.uspto.gov	313-1450
ATTORNIEV DOCKET NO	CONFIDMATION NO

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/187,332	11/06/1998	JOE G. NAYLOR	JFX/027-98	2923
7	590 10/20/2003	EXAMINER		
FARZAD E.		HARRELL, ROBERT B		
BLAKELY SC & ZAFMAN L	KOLOFF TAYLOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
12400 WILSH	IRE BOULEVARD, 7TH	2142	21	
	, ,		DATE MAILED: 10/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
i		09/187,332	NAYLOR ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Robert B. Harrell	2142				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1) 	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 J	ulv 2002					
2a)⊠		is action is non-final.					
	<i>/</i> —						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
· _	Claim(s) 19-36 is/are pending in the applicatio	n.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>19-36</u> is/are rejected.						
·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
	on Papers						
· _	The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)[_]	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accep	•					
11) 🗆 -	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ,				
11)[]	The proposed drawing correction filed on		ved by the Examiner.				
12)[] -	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
		animen.					
_	Inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		. () (0				
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(a) or (t).				
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
* S	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
14) 🔲 A	14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
	a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachmen		. , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,					
2) 🔲 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	5) Notice of Informal F	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) d Office Action .				

Art Unit : 2142

1. Claims 19-36 remain for examination.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:
- a) a patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103, examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligations under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. 102 (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103.
- 4. Claims 19-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho et al. (5,805,298) alone or in view of Fabbio et al. (5,870,089).
- 5. The grounds for rejecting the claims, as presented in the prior Office Action, mailed 4/23/02 (paper #18)), continue and are hereby incorporated in this Office Action by reference.
- 6. The applicant response (filed 7/29/02 (paper #19)) did not amend the claims but elected to argue the rejection by stating in

Art Unit : 2142

substance:

a) it would not have been obvious to modify Ho because the cited prior art including Fabbio does not teach or suggest improving the value of a fax machine as a standalone, document transmission device, by providing the fax machine with the capability of receiving a fax telephone number and an e-mil address of the same recipient and transmitting a converted document to both the facsimile telephone number and to the e-mail address, in response to the same instance of an actuator of the fax machine being activate by the user. However, taking Ho alone, line 2 of Ho's Abstract, col. 1 (lines 39-53), and col. 2 (lines 19-22) taught that Ho's system could send the same document in Fax and e-mail protocols. Thus in view of Ho alone, it would have been obvious to transmit the message via the fax communication lines while at the same time transmitting the email via the email communication lines by modifying Ho to allow the user to enter not only one but both fax and email information. In the alternative, while Ho's figure 3 shows entering either a fax telephone number or an email, Ho's figure 1, similar to the applicant's 4th figure, clearly shows a system which could send both fax and email at the same time; a method clearly covered by Fabbio (col. 3 (line 4-et seq.) which taught of sending fax and email "at the same time" in

Art Unit : 2142

a system such as Ho's;

- b) it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Ho which may also involve a standalone fax machine, with those of Fabbio that are directed to software configuration designed for networked computer systems. However, in Ho's col. 1 (lines 39-53), Ho saw the need to integrated fax and email functions into one machine. Given the infrastructure of Ho's first figure 1, similar to the applicant's fourth figure, with the fact Fabbio taught of sending fax and email at the same time over such a system of Ho's, allowing the user to enter both fax and email data in Ho's system would have been not only an obvious but next evolutionary step for one skilled in the art.
- 7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. The applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). The practice of automatically extending the shortened statutory period an additional month upon the filing of a timely first response to a final rejection has been discontinued by the Office. See 1021 TMOG 35.
- 8. A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Harrell whose telephone number is (703) 305-9692. The examiner

Art Unit : 2142

can normally be reached Monday thru Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and on weekends from 6:00 am to 12 noon Eastern Standard Time.

- 10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley, can be reached on (703) 308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the Group are (703) 746-7238 for After-Final, (703) 746-7239 for Official Papers, and (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official and Draft papers.
- 11. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

ROBERT B. HARRELL PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 2142